

Treasury Department,

Bureau of the Mint,

Washington, D. C., March 21, 1899.

Mr. A. J. Kelston

Selby Smelting and Lead Co.,

San Francisco, California.

Dear Sir:

Yours of March 7th and 16th are at hand and contents noted. I am pleased to be able to inform you that arrangements are being made and will be perfected within a few days under which the gold received at the Seattle Assay Office will be directed to the Mint at San Francisco for coinage, and payment for bullion at Seattle will be made by precisely the same method ^{pursued} at the Mint at San Francisco.

It is scarcely worth while to refer again to the particulars of the controversy which is now, I hope, over, but permit me to say once more that you seem to have charged the Treasury Department with exercising unwisely a discretion which the law does not give to it and which, consequently it has not exercised at all. The Assay Office at Seattle was not established by the Treasury Department but by Act of Congress, nor did the Treasury Department in its discretion extend the privileges or regulations of the New York Assay Office to the Seattle Office; those provisions were extended under a mandatory Act of Congress. The Treasury Department had no choice in the matter and your argument to the effect that the

-2-

"necessities which existed at New York and which resulted in action by Congress extending facilities there which were necessary, do not in our judgment (and the facts will prove the correctness of this statement) justify the application of the same rules to the assay offices throughout the country." An argument over that proposition is entirely superfluous, because the law has provided that such facilities shall be extended to all other Assay Offices in the service. Therefore, I beg permission to adhere to my opinion that you are not "perfectly familiar with the reasons which resulted in extending the objectionable privileges to the various assay offices in the Northwest," if the reasons you have in mind are other than the provisions of law above mentioned. The fact that "certain parties" were confident that certain things would be done, does not signify that they procured such things to be done or that the said things were done in their interest.

I have given a careful hearing to all parties interested in the matter under consideration, have endeavored to weigh the rights of all and to be guided solely by the law and considerations of right and justice. I have finally secured what I, in the beginning, sought, namely: a reasonable rate for transportation between Seattle and San Francisco.

Very truly yours,



Director of the Mint.

Treasury Department,
Bureau of the Mint,
Washington, D.C.,

March 21, 1899.

Mr. A. J. Ralston
Selby Smelting and Lead Co.,
San Francisco, California.

Dear Sir:

Yours of March 7th and 16th are at hand and contents noted. I am pleased to be able to inform you that arrangements are being made and will be perfected within a few days under which the gold received at the Seattle Assay Office will be directed to the Mint at San Francisco for coinage, and payment for bullion at Seattle will be made by precisely the same method pursued as at the Mint at San Francisco.

It is scarcely worth while to refer again to the particulars of the controversy which is now, I hope, over, but permit me to say once more that you seem to have charged the Treasury Department with exercising unwisely a discretion which the law does not give to it and which, consequently it has not exercised at all. The Assay Office at Seattle was not established by the Treasury Department but by Act of Congress, nor did the Treasury Department in its discretion extend the privileges or regulations of the New York Assay Office to the Seattle Office; these provisions were extended under a mandatory Act of Congress. The Treasury Department had no choice in the matter and your argument to the effect that the necessities which existed at New York and which prompted an action by Congress extending facilities there which were necessary, do not in our judgment (and the facts will prove the correctness of this statement) justify "the application of the same rules to the assay offices throughout the country." An argument over that proposition is entirely superfluous, because the law has provided that such facilities shall be extended to all other Assay offices in the service. Therefore, I beg permission to adhere to my opinion that you are not "perfectly familiar with the reasons which resulted in extending the objectionable privileges to the various assay offices in the Northwest," if the reasons you have in mind are other than the provisions of law above mentioned. The fact that "certain parties" were confident that certain things would be done, does not signify that they procured such things to be done or that the said things were done in their interest.

I have given a careful hearing to all parties interested in the matter under consideration, have endeavored to weigh the rights of all and to be guided solely by the law and considerations of right and justice. I have finally secured what I, in the beginning, sought, namely a reasonable rate for transportation between Seattle and San Francisco.

Very truly yours,
[Signature] George E. Roberts
Director of the Mint.